



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/714,724      | 11/16/2000  | Franck Barilloud     | AUS920000483US1     | 9479             |

35525 7590 06/02/2009  
IBM CORP (YA)  
C/O YEE & ASSOCIATES PC  
P.O. BOX 802333  
DALLAS, TX 75380

|          |
|----------|
| EXAMINER |
|----------|

SWEARINGEN, JEFFREY R

|          |              |
|----------|--------------|
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|

2445

|                   |               |
|-------------------|---------------|
| NOTIFICATION DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
|-------------------|---------------|

06/02/2009

ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ptonotifs@yeeiplaw.com

|                              |  |   |  |
|------------------------------|--|---|--|
| <b>Office Action Summary</b> | <b>Application No.</b><br>09/714,724     | <b>Applicant(s)</b><br>BARILLOUD ET AL. |  |
|                              | <b>Examiner</b><br>Jeffrey R. Swearingen | <b>Art Unit</b><br>2445                 |  |

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 February 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 3-12 and 37-41 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 3-12 and 37-41 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. In view of the appeal brief filed on 2/18/2009, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED. New grounds of rejection are set forth below.

To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the following two options:

(1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,

(2) initiate a new appeal by filing a notice of appeal under 37 CFR 41.31 followed by an appeal brief under 37 CFR 41.37. The previously paid notice of appeal fee and appeal brief fee can be applied to the new appeal. If, however, the appeal fees set forth in 37 CFR 41.20 have been increased since they were previously paid, then appellant must pay the difference between the increased fees and the amount previously paid.

A Supervisory Patent Examiner (SPE) has approved of reopening prosecution by signing below:

/Vivek Srivastava/.

### ***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 3-12 and 37-41 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

Art Unit: 2445

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Derby et al. (US 5,426,637).

5. Derby's assignee is International Business Machines Corporation, which is the assignee of the instant application. Derby was issued in 1995, and pre-dates the filing of the instant application by more than five years.

6. In regard to claim 3, Derby disclosed *a method of balancing demand for networked services in a distributed data processing system, the method comprising the steps of:*

*initializing one or more local service managers within the distributed data processing system, wherein each local service manager has information about and provides access to networked services defined within a respective local region of the distributed data processing system for clients within the distributed data processing system, and wherein each client is uniquely associated with a local service manager;*

LAN access agent in column 6, line 10

*initializing one or more distributed service managers within the distributed data processing system, wherein each distributed service manager provides access to networked services to local service managers within the distributed data processing system, and wherein each local service manager is uniquely associated with a distributed service manager;* directory services unit in column 6, lines 18-32

*receiving, at a distributed service manager, a request for a networked service from a local service manager for which the local service manager lacks information; a LAN search procedure described in column 7, lines 24-40*

*determining whether the distributed service manager has information about a networked service with one or more characteristics that match one or more parameters in the request for a networked service, wherein the determining step is accomplished by reference to a cache maintained by the distributed service manager which contains information resulting from prior requests for networked services; and a LAN search procedure described in column 7, lines 24-40*

*returning information about a matched networked service. a LAN search procedure described in column 7, lines 24-40*

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 3-7, and 38-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Elnozahy et al. (US 6,014,686) in view of Chandra et al. (US 6,457,047).

9. In regard to claim 3, Elnozahy disclosed *a method of balancing demand for networked services in a distributed data processing system, the method comprising the steps of:*

*initializing one or more local service managers within the distributed data processing system, wherein each local service manager has information about and provides access to networked services defined within a respective local region of the distributed data processing system for clients within the distributed data processing system, and wherein each client is uniquely associated with a local service manager;* Cell Directory Service, Elnozahy, column 1, lines 41-59; initializes and runs in column 5, lines 20-37

*initializing one or more distributed service managers within the distributed data processing system, wherein each distributed service manager provides access to networked services to local service managers within the distributed data processing system, and wherein each local service manager is uniquely associated with a distributed service manager;* CDS server, column 5, lines 20-37

Elnozahy disclosed a lookup system for distributed directory service information in an network. Elnozahy failed to disclose the ability of said lookup system to cache information.

Chandra disclosed a method of distributed application caching. If the item queried if found, the result is returned to the user and cached locally. Chandra, column 6, lines 20-34. If the information is not found locally, the query will be executed on distributed directories until the information is found. Chandra, column 6, lines 35-61.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to implement distributed caching with the Elnozahy distributed service directory system in order to reduce latency in responding to queries.

Art Unit: 2445

10. In regard to claim 4, Elnozahy in view of Chandra disclosed:

*sending a request for a networked service from a requesting client to a local service manager associated with the requesting client; and Chandra, column 6, lines 20-34*

*returning information about a matching networked service from the local service manager to the requesting client, wherein the matching networked service has characteristics that match parameters in the request for a networked service. Chandra, column 6, lines 20-34*

11. In regard to claim 5, Elnozahy in view of Chandra disclosed:

*receiving a request for a networked service at a local service manager; and Chandra, column 6, lines 20-34*

*determining whether the local service manager has information about a networked service with characteristics that match parameters in the request for a networked service. Chandra, column 6, lines 20-34 - respond to query of directory in Elnozahy/Chandra combination*

12. In regard to claim 6, Elnozahy in view of Chandra disclosed:

*responsive to a determination that the local service manager has information about a matching networked service, returning information about the matching networked service to the requesting client; Chandra, column 6, lines 20-34*

*responsive to a determination that the local service manager does not have information about a matching networked service, forwarding the request for a networked*

Art Unit: 2445

*service from the local service manager to a distributed service manager associated with the local service manager. Chandra, column 6, lines 35-61*

13. In regard to claim 7, Elnozahy in view of Chandra disclosed:

*responsive to a determination that the distributed service manager does not have information about one or more matching networked services, broadcasting the request for a networked service from the distributed service manager to all distributed service managers in the distributed data processing system; Chandra, column 6, lines 35-61*

*receiving information about one or more matching networked services at the distributed service manager in response to the broadcast request; and Chandra, column 6, lines 35-61*

*caching the received information about one or more matching networked services at the distributed service manager. Chandra, column 6, lines 35-61*

14. In regard to claim 38, Elnozahy in view of Chandra disclosed:

*determining whether the distributed service manager has information about a plurality of networked services with characteristics that match parameters in the request for a networked service and forming a set of matched network services; Chandra, column 6, lines 10-19*

*determining, based on the request, whether to return a single matched network service of the set of matched network services or the set of matched network services; Chandra, column 6, lines 20-34*

*responsive to a determination to return a single matched network service, returning information about the single matched networked service from the distributed service manager to the local service manager; and Chandra, column 6, lines 20-34*

*responsive to a determination to return the set of matched network services, returning information about the set of matched network services from the distributed service manager to the local service manager. Chandra, column 6, lines 20-34*

Chandra failed to explicitly disclose only allowing a single result to be returned as a result of a query. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention that based on the results of the query, the user would receive the results that would have been returned from the query. If more than one service met the user's request, then the query would return all matching services. If only one service met the criteria, only one service would be returned.

15. In regard to claim 39, Elnozahy in view of Chandra disclosed *a plurality of types of networked services are available in the distributed data processing system, and wherein one of the characteristics of a matching service is a type of service*. Chandra, column 6, lines 20-34

16. In regard to claim 40, Elnozahy in view of Chandra disclosed *each of the distributed service managers caches information resulting from requests of supported clients, and wherein the information which respective service manager differs according to the requests of supported clients*. Chandra, column 6, lines 35-61 – caching of information based on queries

Art Unit: 2445

17. Claims 8-12 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Elnozahy in view of Chandra as applied to claim 8 above, and further in view of Jindal et al. (US 6,324,580).

In regard to claims 8 and 9, Elnozahy in view of Chandra failed to disclose using load balancing to distribute the selection of a resource. However, Jindal disclosed the use of load balancing to select a preferred server to access a distributed network service. Jindal, column 4, lines 49-67. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to use load balancing in a distributed service network in order to reduce stress on a single server.

18. In regard to claim 10, Jindal further disclosed *comparing network-related metrics during the load balancing operation*. Jindal, column 6, lines 8-15

19. In regard to claim 11, Jindal further disclosed *comparing one or more of network-related metrics associated with a network path between a requesting client and a providing server*. Jindal, column 6, lines 8-15

20. In regard to claim 12, Jindal further disclosed *the network-related metrics are realtime network-related metrics and are selected from a group comprising: bottleneck-link speed, round-trip time, and hop count*. Jindal, column 6, lines 8-15

21. In regard to claim 41, Jindal further disclosed *each of the distributed service managers includes a localization module, wherein the parameters within respective localization modules are tailored to provide different load balancing for corresponding distributed service managers*. Jindal, column 4, lines 49-67 - selecting a preferred server

Art Unit: 2445

22. Claim 37 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Elnozahy in view of Chandra as applied to claim 3 above, and further in view of Fowlow et al. (US 5,920,868).

23. In regard to claim 37, Elnozahy in view of Chandra failed to disclose the use of object request broker services in accessing services in a distributed system. However, Fowlow disclosed accessing objects in a distributed system using an ORB service. Fowlow, column 10, lines 38-58. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to use ORB services with a distributed network to allow remote users to easily access specific services based on their access abilities.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeffrey R. Swearingen whose telephone number is (571)272-3921. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vivek Srivastava can be reached on 571-272-7304. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2445

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Jeffrey R. Swearingen  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2445

/J. R. S./  
Examiner, Art Unit 2445

/VIVEK SRIVASTAVA/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2445